

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/681,420	BRITTAİN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:

- (1) Tiffany A Fetzner.
 (2) Timothy Ziolkowski Reg. No. 38,368.

Date of Interview: 8 June 2004

Status of Application: _____

- (3) Inventor Jean Helen Brittain.
 (4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection concerning Wang et al., US patent 5,928,148

Claims discussed:

1, 28

Prior art documents discussed:

Wang et al., US patent 5,928,148

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the attorney due to applicant's telephonic request to have a telephonic interview with examiner. Applicant's provided a clarification as to the difference between the prior arts of record and the instant invention. Applicant's agreed to let the examiner make an amendment to claim 1 to ensure that there was proper antecedent basis for the limitations of the MR data set, also being limitations of the additional data set(s) of "the" MR data. Additionally the applicant's agreed to let the examiner amend claim 28 to add commas to the "reposition" limitation to overcome the examiner's grammatical objection to claim 28. The examiner's Amendments were made to place the application in condition for allowance..